REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-18, 20-25, 27-29, 31-32, 34, 36-40, 42, 44-45, and 47-50 are pending. In the Final Office Action, all claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent 5,973,722 ("Wakai") in view of certain allegedly inherent properties thereof. No claims are amended in this paper.

This response is believed to be fully responsive to the Final Office Action dated September 20, 2007. Contrary to the statement in the Final Office Action (page 2), Applicants timely filed on June 22, 2007 (and not on July 6, 2007), a petition for an extension of time and a response to the non-final office action dated January 26, 2007.

Applicants reserve the right to set forth additional arguments supporting the patentability of their claims, including the separate patentability of dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers, including an Appeal Brief. In addition, Applicants do not necessarily acquiesce to any characterization by the Examiner of their claims or the prior art, even if such characterization is not explicitly addressed herein. Moreover, for any instances in which the Examiner took Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicants expressly do not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully request that the Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03.

I. Section 103 Rejections

A. Overview of Wakai

Wakai discloses an in-flight entertainment system for an airplane. (Wakai, Abstract.) The system maintains stored audiovisual content on media servers. (Wakai, 5:51-55.) Additional content can be provided to the system via a system interface unit (SIU). (Wakai, 6:34-36.) An audio reproduction unit (ARU), video reproduction unit (VRU), and camera provide content to the SIU. (Wakai, 6:45-63.) Content is distributed throughout the plane via an ATM network provided by an ATM switch. (Wakai, 8:39-43.) Zone units connect to the ATM network and provide content to seat electronics units (SEU) via an IEEE 1394 serial bus. (Id.) The SEUs include digital-to-analog converters and attached audiovisual output devices in order to present content to passengers.

(Wakai, 3:27-30.) Additionally, an attendant control panel provides an interface to process payments and upload content into the system. (Wakai, 12:16-13:6.). As discussed below, Wakai lacks numerous elements recited in Applicants' claims.

B. Claim 1

In the Final Office Action, independent claim 1 was rejected as obvious over Wakai in view of certain allegedly inherent properties thereof. However, at least the below-discussed claim recitations are not taught or suggested by Wakai, nor do any inherent properties of Wakai read on such recitations.

1. "at least one paired analog audio signal..."

Claim 1 recites in part "at least one paired analog audio signal input and analog video signal input." The Examiner alleged that connections to elements 120 and 122 in Figure 1 of Wakai teach this recitation. (Final Office Action, page 2.) Elements 120 and 122 disclose an audio reproducer unit and video reproducer unit. (Wakai, Figure 1.) However, these elements clearly connect to the system interface unit via an RS-485 interface. (Wakai, Figure 7.) An RS-485 interface does not teach or suggest "at least one paired analog audio signal input and analog video signal input." To the extent that the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide a reference demonstrating that an RS-485 interface teaches or suggests "at least one paired analog audio signal input and analog video signal input."

Additionally, the Examiner alleged that Wakai's audio/video input teaches or suggests the foregoing claim recitation. (Final Office Action, page 8.) However, Wakai simply discloses that "[t]he system interface unit 118 is also coupled to receive an external audio/video input." (Wakai, 7:2-3.) This cursory statement is the extent of Wakai's disclosure concerning the external audio/video input. Wakai fails to teach or suggest any additional characteristics of this audio/video input, including "at least one paired analog audio signal input and analog video signal input." The Section 103 rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

2. "an analog-to-digital converter...."

Claim 1 further recites in part an "analog-to-digital converter connected to said audio signal input." The Examiner alleged that Wakai inherently discloses the forgoing recitation. (Final Office Action, page 8.) According to the Examiner, Wakai's video reproducer unit (122) may include a

video cassette player that would be unable to interface to device 118 without "an analog-to digital converter." (Final Office Action, page 3.) However, as discussed in Applicants' previous paper dated June 22, 2007, it appears that any signals received by Wakai's System Interface Unit (118) are already digitized and therefore do not require an "analog-to-digital converter." In fact, Wakai's "Background of the Invention" section explains that "[w]hat is ... needed is a video on demand in-flight entertainment system which uses complete end-to-end digital delivery...." (Wakai, 2:58-60; emphasis added.) Wakai thus teaches away from any need for an "analog-to-digital converter." Wakai's disclosure that a video reproducer unit may be a video cassette player (Wakai, 6:48-51) does not alter this analysis. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's unfounded and unsupported allegation that a video cassette player must be outputting an analog signal in light of Wakai's clearly stated goal of providing "complete end-to-end digital delivery...." (Wakai, 2:58-60.) To the extent that the Examiner is taking Official Notice that a video cassette player cannot output a digital signal, support for such Official Notice is respectfully requested.

Wakai further teaches away from "analog-to-digital" conversion by teaching only digital-to-analog conversion. Wakai explains that "[a]ll communications across the networks are transmitted as digital data and when necessary are converted to analog signals at the seat electronics units." (Wakai, 3:27-30.) Moreover, a text search of Wakai reveals that all ten of the occurrences of the term "analog" appear in the context of converting digital content to analog. For example, Wakai discloses that "a receiving application will receive digital data ... not analog data...." (Wakai, 8:30-32.) Given Wakai's complete focus on digital content and the stated goal of providing "end-to-end digital delivery" (Wakai, 2:58-60), Wakai does not teach or suggest, and actually teaches against, an "analog-to-digital converter."

Accordingly, Wakai fails to teach or suggest an "analog-to-digital converter connected to said audio signal input." The Section 103 rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

3. "at least one connection to said digital data network ..."

Claim 1 further recites in part "at least one connection to said digital data network for receiving an output thereof and providing said output to an audiovisual output device." The Examiner alleged that the backup system disclosed by Wakai teaches the forgoing recitation. (Final

Office Action, page 3, citing Wakai, 6:33-7:4.) However, the backup system disclosed by Wakai does not provide "at least one connection to said digital data network" because it acts as an alternate distribution system unrelated to Wakai's digital data delivery. Specifically, Wakai discloses that "[t]he system interface unit 118 and the overhead video monitors and audio system together provide an alternate and backup broadcast system which allows the airline flexibility in the design of the interior of the airplane's cabin and a backup system in the event of a failure of the video on demand entertainment system." (Wakai, 6:39-6:45, Fig. 1., emphasis added) Accordingly, Wakai's content may be provided via the on demand video system or, alternatively, through the overhead video monitors. Therefore, Wakai's backup system does not teach or suggest "at least one connection to said digital data network for receiving an output thereof and providing said output to an audiovisual output device."

Wakai's backup system does not appear to be connected to Wakai's digital network at all. Wakai includes absolutely no teaching or suggestion of "receiving an output [from the digital data network] and providing said output to an audiovisual output device." By Wakai's own statements, the back up system operates when there is a failure of Wakai's video on demand entertainment system. (Wakai, 6:39-6:45.) Accordingly, the backup system must not be getting its video feed from the video on demand system, i.e. from Wakai's digital data network. The system diagram of Wakai's system interface unit clearly depicts that the overhead video monitors receive their video signals from the video reproducer units. (Wakai, Fig. 7.) When used as an alternate distribution system, the overhead video monitors receive the video feed from the RS-485 interface (722) which also provides an interface for the video reproducer units. (Wakai, Fig. 7.) Wakai's digital data network, represented by the ATM Network interface (704), has no role in this alternate distribution system. (Id.)

Additionally, Wakai actually teaches away from "at least one connection to said digital data network for receiving an output thereof and providing said output to an audiovisual output device." (Wakai, 18:55-19:17.) Referring back to the summary of Wakai's system provided earlier, audiovisual content is output from the system at the seat electronics units (SEU). Wakai teaches the use of zone units as intermediary devices between the data network (ATM Switch) and the audiovisual output devices (SEU). Specifically, "[d]ata transmitted from the headend control

system to the seats is sent over the ATM network, through the ATM switch 116 to the proper zone unit 138 and 140, where it is adapted to the IEEE 1394 format and delivered to the proper seat electronic unit over the IEEE 1394 serial bus." (Wakai, 8:39-43.) Wakai requires the zone units as intermediary devices in order to "eliminate network bottlenecks." (Wakai, 19:9.) Wakai makes clear that directly connecting the audiovisual output devices, i.e. the seat electronic units, to the data network could make the system unusable by "flooding the network." (Wakai, 19:13.) Thus, Wakai would have dissuaded one of ordinary skill from the recited "at least one connection to said digital data network for receiving an output thereof and providing said output to an audiovisual output device."

Accordingly, if Wakai's seat electronic units (SEUs), are interpreted as audiovisual output devices, the SEUs also do not teach or suggest "at least one connection to said digital data network for receiving an output thereof and providing said output to an audiovisual output device." As explained above, the SEUs do not connect to the data network. Instead the SEUs connect to the zone units by way of the IEEE 1394 serial bus. Wakai not only discloses an intermediary device between the network and the audiovisual output devices, but actually teaches away from "at least one connection to said digital data network for receiving an output thereof and providing said output to an audiovisual output device." The Section 103 rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 1, and also claims 2 and 4-5 depending therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record.

C. Claim 7

Independent Claim 7 was rejected as obvious over Wakai in view of certain allegedly inherent properties thereof. However, Wakai neither teaches nor suggests all of the elements of claim 7 including at least those discussed below. Further, Applicants note that to the extent that claim 7 includes recitations similar to those of claim 1, the remarks presented with respect to the recitations of claim 1 are equally valid with respect to the rejection of claim 7. Moreover, claim 7 is patentable over Wakai at least for the reasons set forth below.

1. "an optical disc drive"

Claim 7 recites in part "an optical disc drive ... wherein said optical disc drive outputs an analog video signal." The Examiner alleged (Final Office Action, p. 11) that this recitation is taught by Wakai's Video Reproduction Unit (VRU) and CD Drive (Wakai, FIGs. 1 and 15B). However, Wakai does not teach or suggest "an optical disc drive ... wherein said optical disc drive outputs an analog video signal." Specifically, Wakai discloses that "[t]he video reproducer units 122 could also include one or more video disk players." (Wakai, 6:51-52.) Wakai makes no mention of the type of signal that is output from the video disk players. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request support for the Examiner's apparent taking of Official Notice that Wakai's video disk player is "an optical disc drive ... [that] outputs an analog video signal."

Further, as discussed above, a rejection based on an allegedly inherent feature of a reference must include a conclusion that the feature is necessarily present. However, Wakai introduces considerable doubt that Wakai's video disc player outputs an analog signal by explaining that "[w]hat is ... needed is a video on demand in-flight entertainment system which uses complete end-to-end digital delivery. . . ." (Wakai, 2:58-60; emphasis added.) Accordingly, Wakai's VRU apparently outputs a digital signal and it is thus improper to conclude that "an analog video signal" is necessarily present. Therefore, Wakai fails to teach or suggest "an optical disc drive ... wherein said optical disc drive outputs an analog video signal."

The Examiner further alleged that "at the time of Wakai's invention, televisions are [sic] not capable of reading digital signals yet." (Final Office Action, page 3.) This allegation is not only unsupported but is completely irrelevant because televisions are not present in Wakai. The only mention of television relates to the ability of the system interface unit to receive a television broadcast signal. (Wakai, 13:20.) The VRUs connect to the RS-485 interface (722). (Wakai, Fig. 7.) Therefore, there is no indication related to an output of an analog signal from the VRU to upset the stated goal of providing "complete end-to-end digital delivery...." (Wakai, 2:58-60.)

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 7, and also claims 8-14 depending therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record.

D. Claims 15, 37 and 48

Claims 15, 37, and 48 were rejected as obvious over Wakai in view of certain allegedly inherent properties thereof. However, Wakai neither teaches nor suggests all of the elements of these claims including at least those discussed below. Applicants note that to the extent that claims 15, 37 and 48 include recitations similar to those of claim 1, the remarks presented with respect to the recitations of claim 1 are equally valid against the rejection of claims 15, 37 and 48. Further, these claims are also patentable over Wakai for the reasons set forth below.

1. "an IEEE 1394 bus connected to a digital video camera"

Claim 15 recites in part "an IEEE 1394 port for receiving an IEEE 1394 bus connected to a digital video camera." The Examiner alleged that "[a] broad interpretation of this claim language is that a digital video camera can be connected to the IEEE 1394 bus via other components but not necessarily directly to the bus." (Final Office Action, page 4.) Clearly, the Examiner's interpretation is an unreasonable attempt to gloss over substantial differences between Applicants' claims and Wakai.

Wakai discloses both observation cameras and IEEE 1394 buses. (Wakai, 6:59-63, 7:25-28.) However, Wakai nonetheless does not teach or suggest "an IEEE 1394 bus connected to a digital video camera." Wakai at most discloses IEEE 1394 ports connecting zone units and the seat electronics units (SEU): "Data transmitted from the headend control system to the seats is sent over the ATM network, through the ATM switch 116 to the proper zone unit 138 and 140, where it is adapted to the IEEE 1394 format and delivered to the proper seat electronics unit over the IEEE serial bus." (Wakai, 8:39-43.) Clearly, Wakai's IEEE 1394 ports provide an IEEE 1394 serial bus connection between the zone units and the seat electronics units and no more. As will be shown in detail below, Wakai's camera is totally disassociated with the IEEE 1394 ports located in the zone units and the seat electronic units. Therefore, Wakai fails to teach or suggest "an IEEE 1394 port for receiving an IEEE 1394 bus connected to a digital video camera."

In fact, there are numerous intervening elements between the cameras and IEEE 1394 bus disclosed by Wakai that teach away from "an IEEE 1394 bus connected to a digital video camera." Wakai discloses cameras attached via an RS-485 interface (722) to an A/V MUX (712). (Wakai,

Fig. 7.) An ISA bus (726), processor (700), and PCI bus (724) allow the video signal from the camera to reach an MPEG-2 encoder (714). (Id.) The encoded signal then passes across the PCI bus to reach the ATM network interface (704). (Id.) An ATM switch (116) routes the video transmission from the interface (704) of the system interface unit (118) to the zone units (138, 140). (Wakai, Figs. 1, 7.) Finally, the zone units provide a bridge for the transmission to reach an IEEE 1394 bus to the SEUs (146, 148). (Wakai, Fig. 1.) Thus, Wakai teaches a number of connections, but does not in any way teach or suggest "an IEEE 1394 port for receiving an IEEE 1394 bus connected to a digital video camera."

The Examiner further alleged that "Wakai's teaching of the observation camera is considered to meet the requirement of being directly connected to the IEEE 1394 bus through a port (i.e., the digital camera cannot reasonably be connected to the bus without going through a port) since a digital camera would be preferred to an analog camera because of the availability of the IEEE 1394 bus that goes directly to the user's seat." (Final Office Action, page 5.) However, the observation cameras of Wakai clearly connect to the system interface unit via a RS-485 interface. (Wakai, Fig. 7.) Therefore, Wakai's camera communicates via a RS-485 connection and not an IEEE 1394 connection.

Accordingly, Wakai fails to teach or suggest "an IEEE 1394 port for receiving an IEEE 1394 bus connected to a digital video camera." The Section 103 rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

2. "a micro-controller for receiving user commands..."

Claim 15 further recites in part "a micro-controller for receiving user commands for said digital video camera via said digital data network and controlling said digital video camera in accordance with said user commands." The Examiner alleged that "devices 1104 and 1108 are devices that users can use to issue commands to devices connected to the network." (Final Office Action, page 5.) However, neither elements 1104 and 1108, nor any other element disclosed by Wakai, teach or suggest the foregoing claim recitation. Wakai discloses that "[t]he seat electronics unit 1100 is further coupled to up to three passenger control units 1104." (Wakai, 15:30-32, Fig. 11.) Additionally, "[t]he passenger control handset 1108 is used by the passenger to enter

commands, and data into the system." These passages represent the extent of the Wakai's teaching regarding any type of controller. The Examiner's allegation that Wakai's controller may be configured to control the observation cameras is complete speculation. Wakai provides no teaching or suggestion that would allow one to reach such a conclusion. In all of the portions of Wakai that discuss the observation camera (6:60; 13:18; 13:38; 18:48; 20:63), there is no teaching or suggestion of "a micro-controller for receiving user commands for said digital video camera...." Therefore, Wakai's camera is, at a minimum, not controlled by "a micro-controller for receiving user commands ... via said digital data network ...," and is apparently not controlled at all. The Section 103 rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

3. "an interface for interfacing said IEEE 1394 port..."

Claim 15 further recites "an interface for interfacing said IEEE 1394 port with said digital data network" where "said IEEE 1394 port" is the previously recited "IEEE 1394 port for receiving an IEEE 1394 bus connected to a digital video camera." As explained previously, Wakai's IEEE 1394 ports are located at the zone units. Accordingly, even if Wakai's zone units include an interface for interfacing an IEEE 1394 port with a digital data network, they clearly fail to include "an IEEE 1394 port for receiving an IEEE 1394 bus connected to a digital video camera." Accordingly, Wakai fails to teach or suggest "an interface for interfacing said IEEE 1394 port with said digital data network." The Section 103 rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

Claim 15 has been discussed as an exemplary claim such that the foregoing remarks apply equally to claims 37 and 48. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 15, 37, and 48, and also the claims 16-18, 20-23, 38-40 depending respectively therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record.

E. Claim 24

Claim 24 recites a method that includes "providing said audiovisual data stream through at least one connection to said data network, said connection being capable of accommodating an audiovisual output device." As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Wakai fails to teach or

suggest "at least one connection to said data network, said connection being capable of accommodating an audiovisual output device." Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, claim 24, as well as claims 25 and 27-29 depending therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record.

F. Claim 31, 42 and 45

Claims 31, 42, and 45 were rejected as obvious over Wakai in view of certain allegedly inherent properties thereof. Claim 31 is discussed herein as an exemplary claim. However, Wakai neither teaches nor suggests all of the elements of these claims including at least those discussed below. Applicants note that to the extent that claims 31, 42 and 45 include recitations similar to those of claim 7, the remarks presented with respect to the recitations of claim 7 are equally valid against the rejection of claims 31, 42 and 45. Further, these claims are also patentable over Wakai for the reasons set forth below.

1. "remotely controlling said optical disc drive..."

Claim 31 recites in part "remotely controlling said optical disc drive by entering user commands which are transmitted to said optical disc drive via said network." The Examiner alleged that this recitation is taught by the console/keyboard of the attendant control panel (ACP) of Wakai "since commands to run the CD-ROM drive are entered at the keyboard using the CD-ROM application software." (Final Office Action, p. 6.) The Examiner further asserted that "[t]he terms 'remotely' and 'network' are interpreted broadly." (Id.) The Examiner has taken an unreasonable view of Wakai and Applicants' claims. Wakai's attendant control panel includes a keyboard and a CD-ROM drive as part of an integrated system. (Wakai, Fig. 6; 12:26-28.) Operating a CD-ROM drive from the keyboard attached to the same computer system as the CD-ROM drive is certainly not a remote operation of the drive. In fact, Wakai thus teaches away from "remotely controlling said optical disc drive." Accordingly, the keyboard of Wakai's ACP cannot "remotely control... said optical disc drive by entering user commands which are transmitted to said optical disc drive via said network."

However, even if, arguendo, use of a keyboard teaches or suggests "remotely controlling said optical disc drive," such an operation clearly does not teach or suggest "entering user commands which are transmitted to said optical disc drive via said network." The Examiner alleged that "[b]ecause the keyboard is connected to the CD-ROM drive through a cord, connecting port, an I/O board, a bus, a CPU, a bus, and an I/O board, … these components constitute a network in itself." (Final Office Action, page.6) In other words, the Examiner made the remarkable and unsupported allegation that the system bus and peripheral buses of the attendant control panel (ACP) computer system constitute a network. Applicants respectfully submit that these buses are just that, buses, and are clearly not a network. Accordingly, Wakai's ACP fails to teach or suggest "remotely controlling said optical disc drive by entering user commands which are transmitted to said optical disc drive via said network."

Claim 31 has been discussed as an exemplary claim such that the foregoing remarks apply equally claims 42 and 45. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 31, 42, and 45, and also the claims 32, 34, 36, 44, and 47 depending respectively therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record.

G. Claim 49 and 50

Claims 49 and 50 were rejected as obvious over Wakai in view of certain Officially Noticed elements. However, Wakai neither teaches nor suggests all of the elements of claims 49 and 50 including at least those discussed below. Claim 49 is discussed herein as an exemplary claim. Applicants note that to the extent that claims 49 and 50 include recitations similar to those of claim 1, the remarks presented with respect to the recitations of claim 1 are equally valid against the rejection of claim 49 and 50. These claims are further patentable for the reasons set forth below.

1. "an S-video input paired with a third analog audio signal input"

Claim 49 recites "an S-video input paired with a third analog audio signal input." In rejecting this claim, the Examiner cited a Webopedia entry on S-video to support a taking of Official Notice that S-video connections are known in the art. (Final Office Action, p. 6.) Contrary to the allegations of the Examiner (id.), Applicants did not request the use of Webopedia as a source

of support for the taking of Official Notice. In fact, Applicants reject the use of Webopedia just as the use of Wikipedia was rejected as improper either as direct prior art or in support of Official Notice in Applicants' previous paper. The accuracy and authority of such articles is insufficient to support the Examiner's rejection. Moreover, these articles are undated and therefore do not provide a basis for determining the state of the art at the time of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the Examiner's Official Notice remains unsupported. Applicants timely request that the Examiner provide documentary evidence to support the taking of Official Notice as is required by 37 CFR § 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03. As explained in previous sections, Wakai does not teach or suggest the input of analog sources. Therefore, even if an S-video connection is well known in the art, such a connection is not combinable with Wakai. Therefore, Wakai with or without an S-video connection fails to teach or suggest "an S-video input paired with a third analog audio signal input." The Section 103 rejection of claim 49 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

2. "a first, ... second, ... third, ... and fourth multiplex ..."

Claim 49 further recites:

> a first multiplexer for receiving said first, second and S- video signals and providing a selected video signal to said first video decoder; a second multiplexer for receiving said first, second and third audio signals and providing a selected audio signal to said first analog-to-digital converter; a third multiplexer for receiving said first, second and S- video signals and providing a selected video signal to said second video decoder; and a fourth multiplexer for receiving said first, second and third audio signals and providing a selected audio signal to said second analog-to-digital converter."

While acknowledging that Wakai fails to teach or suggest such a recitation, the Examiner took Official Notice that "using multiplexer[s] ... is well known in the art to select one of many data-sources...." (Final Office Action, p. 19.) Even if this notice were proper, the Examiner has not stated a prima facie case of obviousness by demonstrating, from the prior art, a teaching or suggestion of claim 49's recited first, second, third, and fourth multiplexers attached to specific inputs and specific outputs. This detailed combination of multiplexed inputs connecting to specific outputs is clearly not taught or suggested by Wakai. The Section 103 rejection of claim 49 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

Claim 49 has been discussed as an exemplary claim such that the foregoing remarks apply equally claim 50. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 49 and 50 are allowable over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

All rejections have been addressed. In view of the above, the presently pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. It is believed that any fees associated with the filing of this paper are identified in an accompanying transmittal. However, if any additional fees are required, they may be charged to Deposit Account 18-0013, under Order No. 65783-0009.

Dated: November 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Charles A. Bieneman/
Charles A. Bieneman
Registration No.: 51,472
Glenn E. Forbis
Registration No.: 40,610
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
Correspondence Customer Number: 10291
Attorneys for Applicant